

In her stint as Director of the Family Health Center, Mrs. Trice ensured the provision of high quality, accessible health care to more than 60,000 residents of Liberty City, Hialeah, Brownsville, Little Haiti and other areas northwest of Miami-Dade County. During those harrowing times of cutbacks in health and social services funding at the federal, state and local levels, the Miami Times recalled, "... Mrs. Trice's innovative and uncompromising commitment enabled it to maintain its critical services, while leading efforts to ensure effectiveness and a caring approach were not compromised."

Mrs. Trice truly represents an exemplary community servant who abides by the dictum that those who have less in life through no fault of their own should somehow be lifted up by those who have been blessed with life's greater amenities. As a gadfly among Miami-Dade County's health care professionals, she is wont to prod her colleagues toward ensuring that both political and bureaucratic leadership find a way to develop programs in and of the community, despite the risks.

As one of those hardy spirits who chose to reach out to those living in public housing projects, Mrs. Trice thoroughly understood the accouterments of power and leadership. She sagely exercised them, alongside the mandate of her conviction and the wisdom of her knowledge. The crucial role she played all these years in developing affordable quality family health care evokes a genuine humility as she is wont to say that "... the accolades are not important. What is important is that my community receive the recognition of its strength, despite the adversity, and help for the disproportionate share of the problems it confronts everyday."

Her word is her bond to those who dealt with her, not only in moments of triumphal exuberance in helping many of the poor turn their lives around, but also in her resilient quest to transform Miami-Dade county into a veritable caring community.

Tonight's tribute is genuinely deserved! I truly salute a very dear friend in behalf of a grateful community and I bid her Godspeed.

HONORING KATHLEEN MARY
O'CONNELL

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 1998

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the end of the 105th Congress, I want to recognize Kathleen Mary O'Connell who served on the Committee on Ways and Means staff from May of 1991—until her recent death from cancer on August 29, 1998.

Kathleen's fine reputation and professional skills are well known to all. She was smart, dynamic, charming, quick, a fabulous staffer, an excellent economist, and, most important, a good friend.

Our great sense of loss for Kathleen will continue each day. We always will remember Kathleen fondly.

Kathleen was a graduate of Smith College, and received her master's degree in economics from Duke University. Thereafter, she worked for fifteen years for the Congressional Budget Office, and then for more than seven years for the Committee on Ways and Means.

Kathleen cared about our Federal Government, its programs, and its policies. Most important, Kathleen wanted to make a difference and she did. Kathleen was key staff to all of the tax bills pending before the Committee during her tenure. She provided thorough and critical analyses of the economic, tax, and budgetary implications of legislation under consideration. She argued for fairness and policy decisions that benefitted the average American. Kathleen was a public servant who all of us are proud to have known.

On behalf of the Members and staff of the Committee on Ways and Means, I want to say that we will miss you always, Kathleen.

TRIBUTE TO DANTE FASCELL

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 1998

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, we wish good health to one of the most distinguished retired members of this body in recent history, former Congressman Dante Fascell.

For 38 years, Congressman Fascell proudly and effectively represented the 19th Congressional District of Florida, rising to become the Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

His deliberative, thoughtful manner brought Dante great respect from his colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike.

He left his stamp not only on domestic policies, but particularly on a wide range of foreign policy initiatives where he promoted the American values of freedom, democracy and justice.

Congressman Fascell was instrumental in the passage of the landmark legislation, The War Powers Act, that assures that Congress has a say before our fighting men and women are sent to harm's way.

His fight for freedom and democracy also extended to the suffering people of Cuba.

For decades, Dante was a leading voice condemning the violation of human rights on the island committed by the Castro dictatorship.

All of us from South Florida who cherish his friendship hope that soon Chairman Fascell will be back on his feet enjoying his beloved grandchildren and all his family.

TREATMENT OF CHILDREN'S
DEFORMITIES ACT

HON. SUE W. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 1998

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Treatment of Children's Deformities Act, legislation that prohibits insurers from discriminating against children born with deformities by denying coverage of reconstructive surgery. Children should not only be provided reconstructive surgery to improve the function of a part of the body, but also should be given the opportunity to face the world with a normal appearance. Insurers would like for you to think that such surgery is merely cosmetic—parents of children dealing with the

physical and psychological effects of such deformities would beg to differ.

Today, approximately seven percent of American children are born with pediatric deformities and congenital defects such as birth marks, cleft lip, cleft palate, absent external ears and other facial deformities. A recent survey of the American Society of Plastic and Reconstructive Surgeons indicated that over half of the plastic surgeons surveyed have had a pediatric patient who in the last two years has been denied, or experienced significant difficulty in obtaining, insurance coverage for their surgical procedures.

Some insurance companies claim that reconstructive procedures that do not improve function are not medically necessary and are, therefore, cosmetic. America's physicians recognize an important difference between reconstructive and cosmetic surgery to which this bill calls attention. The American Medical Association defines cosmetic surgery as being performed to reshape normal structures of the body in order to improve the patient's appearance and self-esteem. They define reconstructive surgery as being performed on abnormal structures of the body caused by congenital defects, developmental abnormalities, trauma, infection, tumors or disease.

The Treatment of Children's Deformities Act acknowledges the importance of the AMA's definitions and requires that managed care and insurance companies do the same. The problems that Americans across the board are experiencing with various managed care companies who place cost over quality care is infuriating enough, but when it affects the physical and emotional well-being of children, Congress must be willing to put our foot down.

Please join me in defending the needs of children with deformities and congenital defects and their families by cosponsoring this important bill.

AMERICAN HERITAGE RIVERS
INITIATIVE

HON. HELEN CHENOWETH

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 1998

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech given by Carol LaGrasse of the Property Rights Foundation of America to the Eagle Forum National Conference on September 12, 1998 in Arlington, Virginia. This speech is one of the most insightful discussions about the dangers of the American Heritage Rivers Initiative which my bill, H.R. 1842, would terminate. I encourage my colleagues to read this outstanding speech and share it with their constituents.

THE AMERICAN HERITAGE RIVERS PROGRAM—
A THREAT TO PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS

Thank you for the opportunity to discuss President Clinton's American Heritage Rivers program, a new federal executive program of designating selected major rivers supposedly to preserve their natural, cultural and historic resources.

INTRODUCTION

The American Heritage Rivers program, if successful, promises to diminish local representative government and private property rights. The program is also justifiably opposed because it involves many of the same

parties and extreme preservation thinking of international programs such as the un-ratified Convention on Biological Diversity that came out of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit. But I would like to offer an experience that illustrates the need not to concentrate too much on a single focus in opposing designation programs.

About two years ago, a woman telephoned me at home one morning at 6:30 a.m. She was upset because a land conservancy was going to acquire a tract of forest property from her town of Ellenville, N.Y. Because the UNESCO Biosphere Reserve for the Catskill Mountains, which would have included her town, had recently been defeated, she was concerned about the United Nations. She thought that the property could be somehow going into the hands of the United Nations.

I said to her that in the long term it could be that if we don't remain in control of our government and matters like this it could very well be that the United Nations would be involved in owning and governing land in the Catskills, but that it was important to oppose the land trust acquisition of the property for other reasons. Usually when that land trust acquires property it is for a flip to government under a prearranged deal, I said. While the land trust owns it it does not pay real estate taxes. They may block hunters and fishermen from using the land and generally keep it in a way that it doesn't serve the public from the area forced to give the tax exemption. When the State acquires the land, the town will have little say in how the tract is managed, and the town will be endlessly in conflict with the State over the tax revenues that should be due on the tract. She said that a meeting about the matter was to be held that very evening, and I suggested that before she left for work she follow through with a discussion with the town supervisor and persuade him to consider these issues.

She called the Property Rights Foundation back in a day and left the message because no one was in. She said, quoting almost verbatim, "I called the supervisor and spoke to him. He assured me that the United Nations was not going to acquire the land. I just wanted to let you know that there was nothing to worry about."

Please remember this story, because, in one way or another, it illustrates a number of points. The threat from programs which I call land designations, including the UNESCO Biosphere Reserves and the Clinton American Heritage River pronouncements, is not singular, but multitudinous. We should not focus on the long-term, exotic threat to the neglect of the practical, mundane immediate and short-term.

When you consider that it was I that exposed the UNESCO Biosphere Reserve programs in New York, my husband Peter who with the assistance of my brother at Penn State extract the documents from libraries from New York to Australia to understand the Biosphere Reserve program, and I who was not unjustly blamed for the defeat of the Catskill Mountains Biosphere Reserve, you should not have difficulty accepting my assertion that I have grave concerns about international involvement through such designations. But I consider the sovereignty issue to be one of long-term significance and that at the real and more short-term dangers of such designations, which I will soon be describing, are the essential threat. If we cannot convey these dangers, we do not understand how such designations affect our freedom. We will fail to either monitor them adequately or defeat them. Ultimately, we truly will suffer, in addition, through the loss of national sovereignty. How will this happen? At least in part by more of the same sort of infringements on our rights, imposed

by very similar methods. It will be pitiful, indeed, if the day arrives when we lose home-rule and representative government to a form of government which imposes control from beyond our Constitution and borders.

FINE-SOUNDING GOALS

As you know all too well, government programs that can take away your rights are often couched in very desirable terms. A familiar example is that of imposing national education standards for the purpose of solving the problem of school failure. The idea is that we need the federal government because kids aren't reading and doing math at grade level.

The same system is in vogue for environmental issues. Rivers are portrayed, truthfully or falsely, as badly polluted. Local cultures and historic sites are portrayed as threatened. The beauty of the countryside is being lost to bad land management. Lack of vision and financial resources keeps localities from tackling region-wide issues.

The federal government is seen as visionary enough, geographically big enough and having enough expertise and resources to deal effectively with these real or imagined problems. The federal government is seen as being able to solve the deterioration of the historic architecture of the downtown Main Street, even though federal post offices somehow manage to be built in startling modernistic contrast to colonial, Greek or Victorian downtowns. The federal government will save the local culture. But the federal government condemns and tears down towns with houses by the hundreds for National Parks. But what are the biggest changes in local culture in the last couple of centuries? To start—the automobile, the movement of the workplace from the home to the job site elsewhere, now of both husband and wife. The decline of rural churches, rural agriculture, the end of the one-room school house, the decline of river trade in many areas. And so on. What have these to do with federal policies? About all the federal government can do is promote local museums. If it tries to direct the evolution of the culture by central planning, even less rural prosperity will be the result. Remember—the big impact of these preservation programs is on rural, not urban, America.

But let use move aside from the issues of culture and historic preservation, often used as arguments for the American Heritage Rivers program, to the ones which are at the heart of our concern: the need to control pollution, the need to impose regional planning and the need to control the growth of population, which is related to the perceived planning need. These are the three key areas noted in the official pronouncements nebulously describing the American Heritage Rivers program, and I think that these will be the areas where property rights will be threatened.

PRESERVATIONIST LAND DESIGNATION

My field of concern is private property rights. Private property rights are fundamental to the exercise of all our freedoms. One of my special areas of interests is land designations. Land designations may be honorific, as the U.N. Biosphere Reserves purport to be; pre-zoning, as in the Northern Forest Lands program for New York, Vermont, New Hampshire and Maine; or grandiose direct regional zoning as is the federal Columbia River Gorge Commission, Lake Tahoe Commission mention by Mr. Meese last night and New York State's Adirondack Park Agency which includes 3 million acres of private land, or as were the original plans for the Hudson Valley Greenway.

I got into the problem of these designations because of a 1990 New York study, for the future of the Adirondacks where I unfor-

tunately reside. I obtained the back-up, already-written legislation, which, in conjunction with the report, called for 2,000 acre per house zoning, removing houses where they were visible from highways, which were to become mere travel "corridors," and the acquisition of 2/3 million acres of additional government land from private property owners. I discovered two other overlapping designation programs at the same time—the Northern Forest Lands program for federal zoning over 26 million acres of land, and the Champlain-Adirondack Biosphere Reserve. South of us was the Hudson River Greenway.

We did a tremendous amount of research to ferret out the significance of the Biosphere Reserve designation. Basically, we discovered that the land areas were to be preserved, though whatever government programs are available, by dividing them into core, buffer and transition areas. Core areas, which are to have no permanent human habitation, are to be connected by corridors, also known in the international environmental circles as "land bridges."

In the preservationist's literature, much of it making most peculiar reading, the prime land bridges are considered to be the riverine corridors, the riparian strips, or, put simply, the rivers and the land along them.

Environmental thinking today is to preserve ecosystems connected by corridors. The most extreme presentation of the thinking is in the "wild lands" program, where the core areas, sometimes trumpeted as "ecosystems," are connected by corridors and gradually the cores eat up the buffer areas, the corridors become wider and wider and over the years only isolated areas of inhabited space remain within a thick grid of once small core areas and once narrow corridors. In the end, according to the leading thinkers, 90 percent of the area of the contiguous states is to become entirely wild, with cities in these areas to become only hulking ruins as reminders to the ugly days when civilization predominated. These outlandish ideas are funded lucratively by the Pew charitable trust, the Turner Foundation and others, and so have actually gained ground, but although these ideas are repeatedly in print, the environmentalists will lie through their teeth and deny them when convenient.

I oppose the American Heritage Rivers program for what it does on its face and for what it obviously represents to the environmentalists. The American Heritage Rivers program is one of the top two or three most important programs to those who support the protection of the environment through federal controls. All of these organizations, from the National Audubon Society to the National Trust for Historic Preservation to the Wildlands Project oppose private property rights.

PURPORTED PRACTICES

When speaking publicly, advocates of the American Heritage Rivers program present it as having two main purposes, easing the way of localities in their dealings with federal regulatory agencies and helping to make federal grants available to localities.

HISTORY OF PROGRAM

In my estimation, the American Heritage Rivers program is a substitute for the failed generic American, or National, Areas program which was the subject of a three-year pitched battle in Congress. This battle started in the Democratic Congress, was blocked by our friends, and then went into the Republican Congress, where the national property rights movement organized and the program was defeated. The environmentalists wanted it so badly that, behind the scenes, they offered to concede one of their hardest fought action areas, grazing reform, to have the Heritage Areas bill pass, but the property rights movement prevailed—in spite of

an iffy Republican Congress. At the end of the 104th Congress, an Omnibus National Parks bill passed with a number of individual American or National Areas included, adding to the former ones, and the total of Congressional designations is now sixteen. This includes the Hudson in New York, where even Congressman Jerry Solomon, who long blocked the program, acquiesced, first under pressure from Gingrich to help a New York Democrat Maurice Hinchey in order to get Dems on board, and then in response to the local Republican machine's desire for porkbarrel. This year there is another omnibus parks bill gestating, and more American Heritage porkbarrel Areas may be designated by Congress under Republican leadership.

The President announced in his 1997 State of the Union that he would designate ten American Heritage Rivers, which surprised all of us—we are not insiders. The President's Council on Environmental Quality presented a first description of the program in the Federal Register in May 1997, and early in September 1997 the President issued his executive order with further description. All of the material is quite nebulous, but certain details and phraseology are most revealing. There were also sworn testimonies by the director of the President's Council on Environmental Quality, Katie McGinty, at a July 1997 Congressional oversight hearing and again at a September 1997 Congressional hearing on a bill to stop funding, when a number of national leaders and grassroots activists of the property rights movement spoke. I have noticed that the sworn promises of compromises by Katie McGinty are often meaningless and that the seeming concessions to home-rule in the official publication are also of no importance to the Council when an important designation like that of the entire length of the Hudson River, submitted by Governor Pataki, is under consideration. In that case the promise of the need for community initiation and support was circumvented and the designation actually kept secret as to the areas to be included so that the touchier regions wouldn't know enough to protest.

I was invited to speak at the September 1997 Congressional hearing. You are welcome to take copies of my presentation, which was available on one of the information tables. The hearing was on Representative Helen Chenoweth's important bill H.R. 1832, to deny the use of any federal funds for the American Heritage Rivers program. There is a national drive to add to the current 52 sponsors in the House for Representative Chenoweth's bill. Copies of the bill are on the table. Please take a copy and do your best to bring your Representative on board as a co-sponsor.

The Mountain States Legal Foundation also has a lawsuit constitutionally challenging the American Heritage Rivers program—on Representative Chenoweth's behalf. By using an executive order to establish the program, Clinton has usurped the legislative power of Congress, which is a violation of separation of powers. The case is before the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals.

EFFECTIVE MEANS TO DENY PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS

The American Heritage Rivers program brings grants, computer monitoring and a juggernaut of federal agencies together with the potential to effectively increase government control over private property and thereby deny private property rights.

GRANTS AND ZONING

Using grants as the camel's nose under the tent or as the direct incentive, state and federal government agencies will effectuate the enactment of stricter local, regional or

state-levels zoning. Keep in mind that the preservationists think that it is just as good if locals carry the gun for state or federal level elite planning. Basically, this type of zoning is directed to the gentrification of the countryside, and trying to preserve a beautiful, largely imagined remembrance of the countryside, with no smells, no independently practiced home industry, such as the blacksmiths of the past—the modern counterparts ranging from machine shops to junk yards and gas stations, and no mines or manufacturers as once flourished. They seek to enact a rural landscape of bucolic agriculture and forest extending beyond strictly bordered hamlets. One could spend the time of an entire conference such as this Eagle Forum and begin to touch on the ways that preservation zoning carried out on either a state or local level has destroyed businesses, ruined families and bankrupted innocent people, even sent them to jail.

Just last month I spent a weekend reviewing the pro se (without a lawyer) petition to the U.S. Supreme Court of a bankrupt Massachusetts dairy farmer. He had lost his \$25 million farm and was living with his aged wife in small rented quarters. He was desperately hoping to be heard by a nation's highest court without the help of lawyers, for which he had absolutely no more money, all because of zoning enforced by a local preservationists group. We have many more such heartbreaking examples.

A good example of how a voluntary federal land-use program working in conjunction with grants brings in excessive local zoning is the 1972 federal Coastal Zone Management Act. In 1996 the town of Cocksackie, New York, defeated, a so-called Local Waterfront Rehabilitation Plan, or LWRP, which was basically strict preservation-oriented zoning for the entire township, extending several miles from the river. This planning was promoted by the New York State Department of State to implement the Coastal Zone Management Act. Extremely capable, civic-minded people had to work hard to stave off this basically federal program disguised by the trappings of various state and regional agencies. Grants also promote the full complement of greenway as aspects, namely trails and land acquisition. Land regulation will pressure people into selling out.

COMPUTER MONITORING

The program description promulgated by the Council on Environmental Quality heralds the ability to instantaneously update a publicly available, computerized "state of the river" monitoring of individual river pollution, planning and population. In my opinion, this federal computer monitoring will be by geographic information systems, or GIS, or digitalized data converted on a coordinate basis to computer mapping of overlays of data. Four years ago I wrote a report exposing the Adirondack Park Agency's GIS system of about 30 databases from local assessment records to satellite space imagery. The surveillance capacity is quite serious. Just this year, it came out in the Wall Street Journal that building departments in the U.S. are contracting with the Russian space agency to obtain photos for enforcement purposes. I think that this computer monitoring is also geared to so-called citizen enforcement suits, for both pollution and zoning enforcement. People's lives have been destroyed by such suits. Logging in some national forests has come to a near halt. This year, citizen suit activists have begun bringing proceedings to stop all land activity in entire watersheds because the rivers fed by these watersheds are not up to federal standards.

JUGGERNAUT OF AGENCIES

The federal agencies which are part of the American Heritage Rivers program are the

Departments of Agriculture (which includes the National Forest Service), Defense (which includes the Army Corps of Engineers), Justice, Interior (which includes the National Park Service and the Fish and Wildlife Service), Energy, Housing and Urban Development, Commerce, Transportation, Environmental Protection Agency, National Endowment for the Humanities, National Endowment for the Arts, the Advisory Committee on Historic Preservation, and the President's Council on Environmental Quality. The Corps of Engineers is evolving into the lead agency, for some reason. I have noticed that the Department of Defense is heading and providing headquarters for a Pennsylvania Heritage area program for logging heritage. These thirteen agencies form the American Heritage Rivers Interagency Committee. I think that these agencies, especially the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Park Service, the EPA, and the Corps of Engineers, will become a juggernaut of enforcement of federal regulations and that, with their state contacts, will even enable state environmental enforcement to be more effective and harsh.

THE 1998 DESIGNATIONS

On July 30, following the recommendations of an advisory council of typical participants such as the key environmental groups and political figures from particular heritage areas, President Clinton made the first ten designations at West Jefferson in Ashe County on the New River in Virginia, near the borders of West Virginia and Kentucky. It was widely noted that President Clinton chose that location because he could simultaneously stump in Raleigh for Democrat John Edwards who is running against one of, Clinton's most outspoken opponents, North Carolina Senator Lauch Faircloth.

The first ten rivers are the Hudson, the Mississippi from St. Louis north, the Connecticut, Rio Grande in Texas, Potomac, New River in three States, Detroit River in Michigan, Hanalei in Hawaii, St. John's in Florida, and the Willamette in Oregon. Movement has already started toward adding the rest of the Mississippi, the Susquehanna and Lackawanna watershed and certain rivers in Massachusetts.

The Hudson, Connecticut and northern Mississippi Rivers could potentially make up so much area that it's hard to imagine that selection of grants would be narrowed. It is impossible to know how much area on each side of a river will be included. When I led a contingent of national grassroots property rights leaders to interview Katie McGinty in June 1997, and we asked her this question, she made the odd statement that a watershed varies in its definition. Since a watershed is a scientific term defining geography, this was surprising. But her non-answer did reveal that the designation could be wider than the usual county width for Heritage areas.

I have spent about nine years exposing such designations, including those involving the UN. This one has the noxious characteristics typical of the thinking of the internationalist crowd who not only think of local government as their tool but also think that way of state and the U.S. government.

These are practical matters affecting people today, however. To return to my New York State example, nobody is going back to Congress to ask to repeal the 1972 Coastal Zone Management Act because in 1998 a little town of Cocksackie in New York is worried about the LWRP zoning for the entire town. Five, ten or twenty years from now the layers of bureaucracy implementing facets of the American Heritage Rivers program will become unfathomable. Law enforcement is confusing enough today. Federal, State, and

local law overlap to regulate wetlands, for instance.

During the founding period of this nation, the founders did not want amorphous layers of government whose responsibility for particular impacts was disguised or unclear. They decided that the federal government should rule directly where federal powers applied, rather than coerce the states to pass laws. Today, people have trouble knowing the source of rules regulating their lives. I can describe how federal flood insurance law is carried down through the federal government to the state to the local enforcer, but can one of 100 citizens do this?

The courts have not held that federal incentives to pass state or local laws are unconstitutional, but I believe that these incentives result in a wrongful blurring of responsibility. I think that the same lines of reasoning that argue against the federal government compelling states to regulate apply to the federal government offering or withholding financial aid to persuade States to regulate.

In 1992 when New York blocked the United States government from forcing the State to adopt its own nuclear waste, the U.S. Supreme Court said, " * * * where a Federal Government compel states to regulate, the accountability of both state and federal officials is diminished."

People who have the frustration of dealing with this shuffling of responsibility when federal incentive programs are carried out at the local level do indeed currently experience lack of accountability.

SUMMARY

In opposing the American Heritage Rivers program, we have to fight on the basis of an undefined program. We can argue against the American Heritage Rivers program

(1) on the basis that the reasons offered for the program—grants and alleviation of regulatory problems—are not a logical explanation for it;

(2) on the basis of experience with other pre-zoning programs and seeing how pre-zoning designations pan out;

(3) on the basis of who the program's advocates are and what they have been broadly seeking;

(4) on the basis of the involved agencies and how they have already negatively affected private property rights and local representative government and;

(5) and on the basis of the description of the program.

There is no American Heritage Rivers program description which says in the regulatory language normally promulgated that party A writes the grant terms, party B finds the grants for interested entities, and party C sets the terms for modifying local laws and effectuating certain programs in order to get the grants or the regulatory relief.

On another note, there is certainly no party D who holds hearings and lays out the economic implications of the specifics of the program under the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA.

Published descriptions of the program do not spell out how the environmental preservation groups plan to utilize the computerized state of the river information.

There is nothing in writing that spells out how agencies will be more effective. It is supposedly just better internal management. And other agencies say that GIS is supposedly non-threatening.

In opposing the program, as we did in opposing the Congressional program, we argue most simply that the American Heritage Rivers program is a very large scale attempt to impose national zoning. It is a part of a long pattern of unsuccessful and successful steps to impose federal control of land-use.

The 1970's Jackson-Udall Congressional effort at national zoning was defeated, but many subsequent programs with great effectiveness at such federal control of land-use are in place—wetlands and endangered species protection being the most far-reaching.

STOP THE VIOLENCE IN KOSOVA

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 1998

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, for the past two hundred and fifteen days, the people of Kosova have endured unfathomable brutality and suffering at the hands of Serbian-Yugoslavian authorities.

Over four hundred thousand ethnic Albanians were forced to leave their homes, and more than seven thousand were murdered.

Tragically, these atrocities are still happening.

Homes and villages are being burned, and innocent civilians, including women and children, are being slaughtered.

For nine years, Serbia has repressed and harassed the people of Kosova.

Leaders of the Western world were continuously warned about the distressful situation in Kosova.

But the Western world did not heed those warnings.

In fact, we are still sitting on the sidelines, while we debate what to do.

This indecisive behavior is allowing Slobodan Milosevic to carry out his campaign of ethnic cleansing, violating the human rights of the people of Kosova.

The West must act, and if the West does not act, the United States must act. We cannot wait.

We must remember the commitments that have been made to protect ethnic Albanians in Kosova.

We must not stray away from those commitments now, even though it means making difficult decisions.

We brought peace to the people of Bosnia only after we showed Milosevic that his brute force would be countered with swift and decisive military action.

Now is the time to make sure he knows he faces the same consequences if the violence in Kosova is not put to a stop.

The people of Kosova are being brutalized, and we must not allow it to continue.

HONORING MR. LARRY J. CRISMON FOR HIS 13TH PASTORAL ANNIVERSARY OF BRIGHT TEMPLE CHURCH OF GOD IN SHELBYVILLE, TN

HON. BOB CLEMENT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 1998

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Mr. Larry J. Crismon and his thirteen years of service as the pastor of Bright Temple Church of God in Shelbyville, Tennessee.

On Sunday, October 11, 1998 the congregation of Bright Temple will come together

to honor Pastor Crismon and his wife Audrey for their dedication to the church and their service unto God. I would like to join the congregation in its celebration of the long and distinguished career of Pastor Crismon.

Pastor Crismon's service extends beyond the walls of his church. He has been active in community affairs by serving on the boards of the Red Cross, United Way, Ministerial Alliance, Vocational Advisory Committee, Families First, Child Development Center, Bedford Countains United For a Better Tomorrow, South Tennessee Counseling Association, Tennessee Eastern Second Jurisdiction, and Auxiliaries in Ministry. There is no question that Pastor Crismon's tireless work has made his community a better place for all of its people.

I congratulate Pastor Crismon on his accomplishments and wish him many more years of providing spiritual guidance and community leadership to the people of Shelbyville, Tennessee.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE HENRY HYDE

HON. SONNY CALLAHAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 8, 1998

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share a recent article by syndicated columnist James Pinkerton that pays tribute to the Honorable Chairman of our Judiciary Committee, HENRY HYDE.

The article eloquently points out that Henry is a man of great integrity and unmatched character. Not only has he served us well in the House, but also bravely served our country in combat. I respectfully request that the article be placed in the RECORD so that we can all catch a glimpse into Henry's great contributions and selfless work for this country.

[From the Los Angeles Times]

DON'T ATTACK HYDE FOR INDISCRETIONS OF DECADES AGO, HE'S PAID HIS DUES

(By James Pinkerton)

For two centuries, Henry Hyde said Monday, "Americans have undergone the stress of preserving their freedom." The chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, born in 1924, has been alive for a third of that time, yet most Americans probably didn't know of him until recently.

So who is Henry Hyde? For most of his 23 years as a congressman from Illinois, he has been known for his opposition to abortion. Yet he will also be remembered now as the "family values" conservative who had a four-year affair with a woman other than his wife. Hyde acknowledged the relationship, but the less-than-wisely referred to his 40-something fling as a "youthful indiscretion."

But, if Hyde thinks 40 is young, that might be because he grew up too soon. Because, if what he did three decades ago is of interest, what he did five decades ago, when his country needed him, should be remembered as well.

Hyde joined the Navy at 18, foregoing a basketball scholarship to Georgetown University. For young men such as Hyde, there was no choice after Pearl Harbor. "It was our turn, we did our duty," he said in a recent interview.

Commissioned as an ensign in 1944, he commanded an LCT (landing craft, tank). "A floating bed pan," he called it. His baptism